Venture Financing Series · Part 2 of 3

Liquidation Preference: The Term That Decides Who Really Benefits From the Exit

How liquidation preference shifts exit economics, especially in mid-range outcomes where term-sheet language turns into real money

Johnathan Aloni, Adv. | Strategic Legal Advisor | Dublin / EU

Of all the economic terms in a venture financing, liquidation preference is often the one that matters most at exit. Not because it is the most complicated term, but because it determines who gets paid first, how much they get before others participate, and whether they also share in the upside after that. It is not just downside protection. It is a distribution mechanism.

At a basic level, liquidation preference gives preferred stockholders priority over common stockholders in the distribution of proceeds in a sale, merger, change of control, dissolution, or similar liquidity event. In a qualified IPO, preferred stock will usually convert into common — which means liquidation preference typically matters most in private liquidity events, not in a clean public offering.

1x Is the Baseline, But It Is Not the Whole Story

In a balanced VC financing, the baseline is usually 1x liquidation preference on a non-participating basis: the investor has the right to get back its original investment amount, once, before common stockholders receive anything. But the label can be misleading. The same 1x multiple can be relatively balanced or materially investor-favourable depending on one question: does the investor choose between its preference and its as-converted share, or does it get both?

Non-Participating vs Participating: The Distinction That Drives the Economics

In a 1x non-participating structure, the investor chooses the better of two outcomes: it either takes its liquidation preference — its money back — or converts into common and takes its pro rata share of total proceeds. It does not get both.

In a 1x participating structure, the investor first receives its liquidation preference and then also participates pro rata in the remaining proceeds. That is why participating preferred is accurately described as a double dip.

Consider a simple model: an investor puts in $3 million for 30% of the company.

> $3M exit: Both structures produce the same result. The investor receives $3M, common receives nothing.
>
> $33M exit: Non-participating → investor takes 30% of $33M = $9.9M. Participating → investor takes $3M first, then 30% of remaining $30M = $9M more. Total: $12M. A $2.1M difference from the preference structure alone.
>
> $303M exit: The absolute difference remains $2.1M but is proportionally smaller. In very large exits the double dip matters less.
>
> **The point: liquidation preference matters most in mid-range exits — large enough to create real value, but not large enough for the common to escape the shadow of the preference.**

Participating Preferred With a Cap

There is an intermediate structure: participating preferred with a cap. The investor still benefits from the double dip, but only up to an agreed economic ceiling, usually expressed as a multiple of the original investment. A cap does not eliminate participation — it limits how far participation can go.

Using the same example with a 4x cap on a $3M investment: at a $45M exit, the investor's capped return of $12M is less than its as-converted return of $13.5M, so it would rationally choose the as-converted result instead. A cap does not make the preference founder-friendly. It simply places a ceiling on how long the double dip can extract value.

Seniority: Who Sits Above Whom

Once a company has multiple rounds, the preferred stack itself may have an order of priority. Later investors may be senior to earlier investors, or the different series may sit pari passu and share proceeds at the same level. Seniority is negotiated, not assumed. Even a seemingly moderate 1x non-participating preference can become significantly more aggressive if a later series sits on top of it.

What Founders Should Actually Do

In a balanced round, the founder's target should usually be clear: 1x non-participating preferred, no multiple above 1x, no participating feature, and no aggressive seniority structure unless there is a real economic justification.

But that is not enough. Founders should not manage liquidation preference as a label. They should manage it as a model. Ask for a real waterfall analysis across at least three scenarios: a small exit, a mid-range exit, and a large exit. And that model should reflect not just headline valuation — it should account for escrow, holdbacks, contingent consideration, and any proceeds that are not clean cash at closing.

Liquidation preference should not be managed as a label. It should be managed as a waterfall.

Something in this article applies to your situation?

Reach out at john@jaconsulting.pro or visit jaconsulting.pro/contact